UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,995	01/09/2006	Andrea Milanesi	DE03 0240 US1	7025
65913 NXP, B.V.	7590 04/07/201	EXAMINER		
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE			CERULLO, LILIANA P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN JOSE, CA	A 95131	2629		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/07/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/563,995	MILANESI, ANDREA	
Examiner		Art Unit	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears  THE REPLY FILED 01 April 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLIC  1. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the	on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
·		-					
1 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the	CATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.					
application, applicant must timely file one of the following rep application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing da	<del>-</del>						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN 1 MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on whave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shor set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	sion and the corresponding amount of tened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliar	nce with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensic Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within AMENDMENTS	on thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but	prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Callee				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consider			Cause				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or	form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corr	esponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121.	Sac attached Nation of Nan Cor	maliant Amandmant (	OTOL 224)				
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ul>		npliant Amendment (i	-10L-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and su was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	the status of the claims after en	try is below or attache	ed.				
	11. 🛮 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PT	O/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
/Kevin M Nguyen/	/L. C./						
Acting SPE of Art Unit 2629	Examiner, Art Unit 2629						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On the Remarks dated 4/1/2011 pg. 7-8, the Applicants argue that Tsuchi ('749) and Sakurai ('548) fail to disclose an input stage "configured to keep the ratio of the transconductance of the NMOS transistor doublet and the transconductance of the PMOS transistor doublet constant" because the Tsuchi's input stage (Fig. 1) is not an equivalent of Sakurai's input stage (Fig. 1) and teaches away from using the cited embodiment because the '548 Fig. 1 is used as background art and thus it's described with undesired performance. The examiner must respectfully disagree, note that the switches 112-119 in Tsuchi's Fig. 1 are used to obtain the configurations shown in Tsuchi's Figs. 3A-3B, which continue to show a differential pair with two p-type and two n-type transistors, such as the described in Sakurai's Fig. 1; thus the concept of the output current and consequently of the constant transconductance as taught by Sakurai in cols. 1-2 is equivalent to the observed in Tsuchi's differential amplifier. With respect to Sakurai teaching away from the claimed invention because it is described in the background, please note that Sakurai describes the operation of a conventional diferential pair op. amp which was used in VLSI circuits. The Applicant also argues with respect to claim 2 (see Remarks dated 4/1/2011 pg. 8) that Nishimura ('255) fails to disclose the switching for operation based on positive/negatve gamma data, please see Final Rejection dated 2/03/2011 pg. 16 for a response to these arguments.